arXiv:1207.7063v1 [math.AP] 30 Jul 2012

On Nonlinear Parabolic Equation in Nondivergent Form with Implicit Degeneration and Embedding Theorems

Kamal N. Soltanov and Mahmud A. Ahmadov

Abstract. The mixed problem for the implicit degenerating nonlinear parabolic equation is considered, and the solvability and behavior of solutions of this problem are studied. Furthermore, some classes of function spaces and their relations with Sobolev spaces are investigated, embedding and compactness theorems for these spaces are proved

1. Introduction

Consider the following problem

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}-|u|^{\rho}\Delta u+b_0|u|^{\mu+1}=h(t,x), \quad (t,x)\in Q_T\equiv(0,T)\times\Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u(0,x)=0, \quad x\in\Omega\subset R^n, \quad n\geq 1, \tag{1.2}$$

$$u(t,x)\mid_{\Gamma}=0, \quad \Gamma\equiv[0,T]\times\partial\Omega,\ T>0, \tag{1.3}$$

Here Ω is a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ (for example, $\partial\Omega\in C^1$), $\Delta\equiv\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ is a Laplacian, $\rho>0,\mu\geq 0$, $b_0\in R^1$ are some numbers, $h(t,x)$ is a certain function.

The equation (1.1) describes the behavior of a flow on a boundary layer (see, [**14, 23, 8**]) and is also called Prandtl-von Mises type equation. The solvability of such type of equations and the behavior of their solutions are considered in many works (for example, [**7, 12, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25**] and references therein). In one-dimensional case, the existence of solution of the considered equation, and functional spaces where the solution belongs to are obtained in [**16, 20**] (see also references in [**18**]).

The main point of this work is considering the problem (1.1) - (1.3) in n-dimensional case without additional conditions. Namely, the existence theorem is proved; spaces generated by the considered problem, their properties (particularly, some smoothness results of solutions are obtained as corrolaries of proved embedding theorems) and the behavior of solution are studied.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35K55, 35K65, 35G30; Secondary 46E40, 46.20, 46T99.

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear parabolic equation, implicit degenerating, nonlinear functional spaces, embedding theorems.

Boundary value problems often lead to study of functional spaces related to the considered problems directly. More precisely, mentioned spaces are domains of operators generated by boundary value problems. For instance, we can say that the Sobolev spaces and their different generalizations appear while studying boundary value problems for the linear differential equations.

Unlike linear boundary value problems, in nonlinear cases sets generated by problems, i.e. the domains of the corresponding operators, roughly speaking, are subsets of linear spaces, but not possessing the linear structure. Therefore, in the beginning we would be concentrated on investigation of these infinity dimensional manifolds.

2. Existence Theorem

Define the following function space:

$$\mathbf{P}_{1,p,q}\left(Q_T\right) \equiv W_q^1\left(0,T;L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right) \cap L_p\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right)\right), \tag{2.1}$$

where $p,q \geq 1$, $\rho \geq 0$ are some numbers, $W_q^1\left(0,T;L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ is a vector Sobolev space, and for functions $u:\Omega \longrightarrow R^1$

(2.2)

$$\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right) \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1\left(\Omega\right) \left| [u]_{S_{\Delta,\rho,2}}^{\rho+2} \equiv \int\limits_{\Omega} \left|u\right|^{\rho} \left|\Delta u\right|^2 dx < +\infty,\ u\left(x\right) \mid_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \right.\right\}.$$

and for functions $u: Q_T \longrightarrow R^1$

$$L_p\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right)\right) \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1\left(Q_T\right) \left| [u]_{L\left(S_{\Delta,\rho,2}\right)}^{p} \equiv \int\limits_0^T [u]_{S_{\Delta,\rho,2}}^{p} dt < +\infty, \right.\right.$$

$$u\left(t,x\right) \mid_{[0,T]\times\partial\Omega} = 0 \Big\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Our main result on solvability of the problem (1.1) - (1.3) is

Theorem 1. *Let* $\rho > 0$, $\min\left\{0,\frac{\rho}{2}-1\right\} \leq \mu < \rho \leq 2$ *or* $\frac{\rho}{2}-1 \leq \mu < \rho$ *and* $b_0 \in R^1$. *Then, for any* $h \in L_2\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}_2^1\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ *the problem (1.1) - (1.3) is solvable in* $\mathbf{P}\left(Q\right) \equiv \mathbf{P}_{1,p,q}\left(Q_T\right) \cap \left\{u\left(t,x\right) \mid u\left(0,x\right)=0\right\}$, *where* $p=\rho+2$, $q=p' = \frac{\rho+2}{\rho+1}$.

The proof is based on a general result (Theorem 2) that is given below.

Let X and Y be Banach spaces with duals X^* and Y^* respectively, Y is a reflexive Banach space, $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq X$ be a weakly complete "reflexive" pn-space (see, Appendix A or [S3, S5]), $X_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0 \cap Y$ is a separable vector topological space such that $\overline{X_0}^{\mathcal{M}_0} \equiv \mathcal{M}_0$, $\overline{X_0}^{Y} \equiv Y$ and

i) $f: \underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right) \to L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ is a weakly compact (weakly continuous) mapping, where

$$\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right) \equiv L_p\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0\right) \cap W_q^1\left(0,T;Y\right) \cap \left\{x\left(t\right) \mid x\left(0\right)=0\right\},$$

$1 < \max\{q,q'\} \leq p < \infty$, $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$;

(ii) there is a linear continuous operator $L : W^{s}_{p_0}\left(0,T;X_0\right) \to W^{s}_{p_0}\left(0,T;Y^{*}\right)$, $s \geq 0$, $p_0 \geq 1$ such that L commutes with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ and the conjugate operator L^{*} has $ker(L^{*}) = \{0\}$;

(iii) there exist a continuous function $\varphi : R^{1}_{+} \cup \{0\} \longrightarrow R^{1}_{+} \cup \{0\}$ and numbers $\tau_0 \geq 0$ and $\tau_1 > 0$ such that $\varphi(r)$ is not decreasing for $\tau \geq \tau_0$, $\varphi\left(\tau_1\right) > 0$ and for any $x \in L_p\left(0,T;X_0\right)$ operators f and L satisfy the inequality

$$\int_0^T \langle f(t,x\left(t\right)), Lx\left(t\right)\rangle dt \geq \varphi\left([x]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)}\right)[x]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)};$$

(iv) there exist a linear bounded operator $L_0 : X_0 \to Y$ and constants $C_0 > 0$, $C_1, C_2 \geq 0$, $\nu > 1$ such that the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \xi\left(t\right), L\xi\left(t\right)\rangle dt &\geq C_0 \left\|L_0\xi\right\|^{\nu}_{L_q(0,T;Y)} - C_2, \\ \int_0^t \langle \frac{dx}{d\tau}, Lx\left(\tau\right)\rangle d\tau &\geq C_1 \left\|L_0 x\right\|^{\nu}_{Y}\left(t\right) - C_2, \quad a.e.\ t \in [0,T] \end{aligned}$$

hold for arbitrary $x \in W^{1}_{p}\left(0,T;X_0\right)$ and $\xi \in L_p\left(0,T;X_0\right)$.

THEOREM 2. *Assume that conditions (i) - (iv) are fulfiled. Then, for any* $y \in G \subseteq L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$, $G \equiv \underset{r \geq \tau_1}{\cup} G_r$*:*

$$G_r \equiv \left\{ y \in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right) \middle| \int_0^T \left|\langle y\left(t\right), Lx\left(t\right)\rangle\right| \, dt \leq \int_0^T \langle f(t,x\left(t\right)), Lx\left(t\right)\rangle dt - c, \right.$$

$$\left. for\ all\ x \in L_p\left(0,T;X_0\right),\ [x]_{L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)} = r \right\},\ C_2 < c < \infty$$

the Cauchy problem

$$\frac{dx}{dt} + f(t,x\left(t\right)) = y\left(t\right), \quad y \in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right); \quad x\left(0\right) = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

is solvable in $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right)$ *in the following sense*

$$\int_0^T \left\langle \frac{dx}{dt} + f(t,x\left(t\right)), y^{*}\left(t\right)\right\rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle y\left(t\right), y^{*}\left(t\right)\rangle \, dt, \quad \forall y^{*} \in L_{q'}\left(0,T;Y^{*}\right).$$

The proof of this result is presented in Appendix C (one can also refer to proofs of similar theorems in [**18, 20**]). The next proposition follows immediately from the last theorem.

COROLLARY 1. *Under assumptions of Theorem 2 the problem (2.4) is solvable in* $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right)$ *for any* $y \in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ *satisfying the condition: there is* $r > 0$ *such that the inequality*

$$\left\|y\right\|_{L_q(0,T;Y)} \leq \varphi\left([x]_{L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)}\right)$$

holds for any $x \in L_p(0,T;X_0)$ *with* $[x]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)} = r$. *Furthermore, if* $\varphi(\tau) \nearrow \infty$ *as* $\tau \nearrow \infty$ *then the problem (2.4) is solvable in* $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y)$ *for any* $y \in L_q(0,T;Y)$ *satisfying the inequality*

$$\sup\left\{\frac{1}{[x]_{L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)}}\int\limits_0^T \langle y(t), Lx(t)\rangle\, dt \;\Big|\; x \in L_p(0,T;X_0)\right\} < \infty.$$

3. Embedding Theorems on pn-Spaces

In this section we introduce and investigate properties of a class of nonlinear function spaces (pn-spaces) that are connected to the considered problem directly. These spaces are necessary in application of Theorem 2 (and Corollary 1) to the considered problem.

Consider the following function spaces (class of functions $u : \Omega \longrightarrow R$)

$$S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega) \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1(\Omega) \;\middle|\; [u]_{S_1}^{\alpha+\beta} \equiv \int\limits_{\Omega} \left[|u|^{\alpha+\beta} + |u|^{\alpha}|\nabla u|^{\beta}\right] dx < \infty, \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega) \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1(\Omega) \;\middle|\; [u]_{S_\Delta}^{\alpha+\beta} \equiv [u]_{S_1}^{\alpha_1+\beta_1} + \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha}|\Delta u|^{\beta} dx < \infty, \right\}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\alpha \geq 0$, $\frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} > -1$, $\beta, \beta_1 \geq 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = \alpha + \beta$. Here and hereafter we assume $\beta > 1$. Further, we consider the case $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} > -1$, $\beta > 1$, $\alpha > \beta - 1$, as well.

Also, consider the following spaces of functions $u : Q_T \longrightarrow R^1$

$$L_p(0,T;S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)) \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1(\Omega) \;\middle|\; [u]_{L(S_1)}^{p} \equiv \int\limits_0^T [u]_{S_1}^{p}\, dt < \infty, \right\}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$P_{p_0,p_1}(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega);X) \equiv W_{p_0}^1(0,T;X) \cap L_{p_1}(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)), \tag{3.4}$$

where $p, p_0, p_1, \beta > 1$, $\alpha \geq 0$ and X is a Banach space. Particularly, X can be choosen in such a way that $L_{p_0}(\Omega) \subseteq X$ for some $p_0 \geq 1$.

The space $L_{p_1}(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega))$ is defined as $L_p(0,T;S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega))$ by using (3.2) instead of (3.1).

The equivalency

$$\mathcal{M}_{\eta,W_\beta^1(\Omega)} \equiv \left\{ u \in L_1(\Omega) \;\middle|\; \eta(u) \in W_\beta^1(\Omega),\ \eta(u) \equiv |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} u \right\} \equiv S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$$

that express relations between $W_\beta^1(\Omega)$ and $S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ follows immediately from (3.1). Indeed, it is enough to note that $\eta(u) \equiv |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} u = v \Longleftrightarrow u = |v|^{\frac{-\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}} v \equiv \eta^{-1}(v)$.

Taking the last equivalency and definition (3.2) of the space $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ into account we get

$$S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega) \equiv \mathcal{M}_{\eta,W_{\beta_1}^1(\Omega)} \cap \left\{ u \;\middle|\; |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \Delta u \in L_\beta(\Omega), \right\}. \tag{3.5}$$

In our next step we are going to express the relations between the second order Sobolev spaces and $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$. To this end we use a few auxilary results.

The following equality will be used in our discussion. Let's put $\eta(u) \equiv |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} u \equiv v$. Then

$$\Delta v \equiv (\Delta \circ\ \eta)(u) \equiv \Delta\eta(u) \equiv \Delta\left(|u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} u\right) = \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\beta}\ |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \nabla u\right) =$$

$$= \frac{\alpha+\beta}{\beta} |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \Delta u + \frac{\alpha(\alpha+\beta)}{\beta^2}\ |u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}-2}\ u\ |\nabla u|^2 . \tag{3.6}$$

Proposition 1. *Let* $\alpha > -1, \beta \geq \beta_0 \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 1$ *be some numbers,* $\beta_0 + \beta \geq 2$ *and* $\Omega \subset R^n$, $n \geq 1$, *be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary* $\partial\Omega$. *Then the inequality*

$$\int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} |\nabla u|^{\beta_0+\beta} dx \leq c(\varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta_0} \left|D_i^2 u\right|^{\beta} dx + \varepsilon_1 \kappa(\beta-\beta_0) \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta_0+\beta} dx \tag{3.7}$$

holds for any $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C_0^1\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)$, *where* $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(\varepsilon)$ *are some numbers,* $\kappa(s) = 1$ *if* $s > 0$, *and* $\kappa(s) = 0$ *if* $s = 0$.

Proof. We have

$$\int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} |\nabla u|^{\beta_0+\beta} dx \leq c \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} |D_i u|^{\beta_0+\beta} dx =$$

$$-c_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} u |D_i u|^{\beta_0+\beta-2} D_j^2 u dx \leq$$

Rewriting the expression under the integral in the following form

$$\left(|u|^{\alpha - \frac{\alpha+\beta_0}{\beta} - \alpha\frac{\beta_0+\beta-2}{\beta_0+\beta}} u\right)\left(|u|^{\alpha\frac{\beta_0+\beta-2}{\beta_0+\beta}} |D_i u|^{\beta+\beta_0-2}\right)\left(|u|^{\frac{\alpha+\beta_0}{\beta}} D_i^2 u\right) \text{ if } \beta > \beta_0$$

or

$$\left(|u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta'}} u |D_i u|^{2\beta-2}\right)\left(|u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} D_i^2 u\right) \text{ if } \beta = \beta_0$$

and applying Young's inequality with exponents

$$p_0 = \frac{\beta(\beta_0+\beta)}{\beta-\beta_0}, p_1 = \frac{\beta_0+\beta}{\beta_0+\beta-2},\ p_2 = \beta \text{ if } \beta > \beta_0$$

or

$$p_0 = \beta', p_1 = \beta \text{ if } \beta = \beta_0,\ \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta'} = 1$$

we get

$$\leq \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left[\kappa(\beta-\beta_0) |u|^{\alpha+\beta_0+\beta} + |u|^{\alpha} |D_i u|^{\beta_0+\beta}\right] dx +$$

$$c(\varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta_0} \left|D_i^2 u\right|^{\beta} dx \leq$$

or

$$\varepsilon_1 \kappa(\beta-\beta_0) \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta_0+\beta} dx + \varepsilon_2 \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} |\nabla u|^{\beta_0+\beta} dx +$$

$$c_4(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta_0}\left|D_i^2u\right|^{\beta}dx \tag{3.8}$$

The second term in (3.8) is obtained by using the equivalency

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}\sum_{i=1}^{n}|D_iu|^{\beta_0+\beta}dx\leq\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}|\nabla u|^{\beta_0+\beta}dx\leq n\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}\sum_{i=1}^{n}|D_iu|^{\beta_0+\beta}dx. \tag{3.9}$$

Note that the first term of (3.8) vanishes if $\beta=\beta_0$. Obtained inequalities prove the statement of the proposition. □

Remark 1. *It is not difficult to see that if* $\alpha+\beta_0+\beta>1$, $\beta_0\geq 0$, $\beta_1\geq 1$ *then*

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta_0+\beta}dx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta_0}|\nabla u|^{\beta}dx \quad or \quad \int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta_0+\beta}dx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}|\nabla u|^{\beta_0+\beta}dx \tag{3.10}$$

and if $1\leq\alpha_0+\beta_0\leq\alpha_1+\beta_1$, $1\leq\beta_0\leq\beta_1$, $\alpha_0\beta_1\geq\alpha_1\beta_0$ *then*

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha_0}|\nabla u|^{\beta_0}dx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha_1}|\nabla u|^{\beta_1}dx+c_1 \tag{3.11}$$

hold for any $u\in C_0^1(\Omega)$, *where*

$$c=c(\alpha,\beta_0,\beta,mes\ \Omega)>0,\ c_1=c_1(\alpha_0,\beta_0,\alpha_1,\beta_1,mes\ \Omega)\geq 0,$$

Moreover, if $\alpha_0+\beta_0=\alpha_1+\beta_1$ *then* $c_1=0$.

Proposition 2. *Let* $\alpha>-1$, $\beta\geq 1$ *be some numbers,* $\alpha+\beta\geq 2$ *and* $\Omega\subset R^n$, $n\geq 1$, *be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary* $\partial\Omega$. *Then the inequality*

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta}dx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}|\Delta u|^{\beta}dx. \tag{3.12}$$

holds for any $u\in C^2(\Omega)\cap C_0^1\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)$, *where* $c=c(\alpha,\beta,mes\ \Omega)>0$.

Proof. Rewriting $\alpha+\beta$ as $\alpha+\beta-2+2=\alpha+\beta_0+\beta_1$ with $\beta_0=\beta-2$ and $\beta_1=2$ and applying the first one of inequalities (2.10) we get

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta}dx\equiv\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+(\beta-2)+2}dx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta-2}|\nabla u|^{2}dx. \tag{3.13}$$

The right hand side of the last inequality is estimating as

$$\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta-2}|\nabla u|^2dx=\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta-1}\int_{\Omega}\nabla\left(|u|^{\alpha+\beta-2}u\right)\cdot\nabla udx=$$

$$-\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta-1}\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta-2}u\Delta udx\leq c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta-1}|\Delta u|dx=$$

$$c\int_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta-1-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}|u|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}|\Delta u|dx$$

Now, applying the Young's inequality with exponents $\left(\beta, \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}\right)$ and arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ gives

$$\leq c\left(\varepsilon\right) \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} \left|\Delta u\right|^{\beta} dx + \varepsilon \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta} dx. \tag{3.14}$$

The inequality (3.12) follows from (3.13) taking (3.14) into considiration and making ε sufficiently small. □

The following result is a special case of the main inequality (3.22)[1]

Lemma 1. *Let* $\alpha > -1$, $\beta > \frac{n}{n-1}$ *be some numbers,* $\Omega \subset R^n$, $n \geq 2$, *be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary* $\partial\Omega$. *Then the inequality*

$$\int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha} \left|\nabla u\right|^{2\beta} dx \leq c_1 \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+\beta} \left|\Delta u\right|^{\beta} dx + c_2 \int\limits_{\Omega} |u|^{\alpha+2\beta} dx. \tag{3.15}$$

holds for any $u \in C^2\left(\Omega\right) \cap C_0^1\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)$, *where* $c = c\left(\alpha, \beta\right) > 0$.

Proof. [2]The proof of the inequality (3.15) is based on the boundedness in the Lebesque space $L_p(\Omega)$ of the local Hardy-Littlwood maximal function

$$M_{\Omega} w\left(x\right) = \sup_{0<r<dist(x,\partial\Omega)} \frac{1}{\left|B_r\left(x\right)\right|} \int\limits_{B_r(x)} w\ (y) dy;$$

$$\left|B_r\left(x\right)\right| \equiv \mu\left(B_r\left(x\right)\right) \equiv \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)}$$

when $1 < p < +\infty$ (see [**15**]), the local spherical maximal function

$$\left(A_r w\right)\left(x\right) = \sup_{0<r<dist(x,\partial\Omega)} \int\limits_{S_1(0)} w(x+ry)\ dS(y);\ S_r(x) = \partial B_r(x)$$

when $p > \frac{n}{n-1}$, $n \geq 2$ (see [**15**]), and on $L_p(\Omega)-$convergency of averages of a function to the function itself

$$\lim_{r\searrow 0} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left| \frac{1}{\left|B_r\left(x\right)\right|} \int\limits_{B_r(x)} w(y)\ dy - w(x) \right|^{p} dx = 0 \tag{3.16}$$

Let's put $w(x) \equiv |u(x)|^{\rho} \left|\nabla u(x)\right|^2$ for a function $u \in C^2\left(\Omega\right) \cap C_0^1\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)$. Then, under the conditions of Propositon 1 and boundedness of the local Hardy-Littlwood maximal function, for $\rho = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ we have

$$\int\limits_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{\left|B_r\left(x\right)\right|} \int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^{\rho} \left|\nabla u\right|^2\ dy \right)^{\beta} dx \leq c \int\limits_{\Omega} \left(|u|^{p} \left|\nabla u\right|^2\right)^{\beta} dx. \tag{3.17}$$

---

[1] For $n = 1$ the similar results to results of this section was proved in the earlier works (see, for example, [S1, S5]). Therefore, it is enough to consider just dimension $n \geq 2$.

[2] It should be noted that this approach of the proof is suggested by the second author.

Moreover, it is obvious that

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{S_r(x)} |u|^\rho u\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\ dS(y) =$$

$$\frac{1}{|B_1(0)|\,r^n}\int\limits_{S_1(0)} |u(x+r\eta)|^\rho u(x+r\eta)\left(\nabla u(x+r\eta)\cdot\nu\right) r\ r^{n-1} dS(\eta),$$

Therefore, from the boundedness of a local spherical maximal function, we have

$$\int\limits_\Omega \left|\frac{1}{|S_1(0)|}\int\limits_{S_1(0)} |u(x+r\eta)|^\rho u(x+r\eta)\left(\nabla u(x+r\eta)\cdot\nu\right) ds(\eta)\right|^\beta dx \leq$$

$$c\int\limits_\Omega \left(|u(x)|^{\rho+1}|\nabla u(x)|\right)^\beta dx, \tag{3.18}$$

where the positive constant c does not dependent on the function $u(x)$.

According to (3.6) we have

$$\nabla\cdot\left(\ |u|^\rho\ \ u\nabla u\right) = |u|^\rho\Delta u + (\rho+1)\ \ |u|^\rho\ \ |\nabla u|^2$$

Taking the integral of both sides of this equality on $B_r(x)$, for $x\in\Omega$, and $0<r<dist(x,\partial\Omega)$ we recieve

$$\frac{\rho+1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho|\nabla u|^2\ dy =$$

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} \nabla\cdot\left(\ |u|^\rho u\ \nabla u\right) dy - \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho u\Delta u dy$$

or

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho\ \ |\nabla u|^2 dy =$$

$$\frac{1}{(\rho+1)}\left\{-\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho u\Delta u dy + \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{S_r(x)} |u|^\rho u\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\ dS(y)\right\} \tag{3.19}$$

Using (3.19), the left part of (3.15) is estimated in the following way

$$\int\limits_\Omega \left[|u|^\rho|\nabla u|^2\right]^\beta dx \leq c\int\limits_\Omega \left||u|^\rho|\nabla u|^2 - \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho|\nabla u|^2\ dy\right|^\beta dx +$$

$$c\int\limits_\Omega \left|\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)} |u|^\rho|\nabla u|^2\ dy\right|^\beta dx = I_1(r)+I_2(r) \tag{3.20}$$

According to (3.16) we have $\lim\limits_{r\to 0} I_1(r) = 0$. Therefore, it is enough to show that $I_2(r)$ is estimated uniformly with respect to the r.Taking (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19) into consideration in $I_2(r)$ we get

$$I_2(r) = c\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)}|u|^{\rho}|\nabla u|^2\ dy\right|^{\beta}dx =$$

$$c\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|-\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)}|u|^{\rho}u\Delta u dy+\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{S_r(x)}|u|^{\rho}u\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\ dS(y)\right|^{\beta}dx \leq$$

$$c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{B_r(x)}|u|^{\rho}u\Delta u dy\right|^{\beta}dx + c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int\limits_{S_r(x)}|u|^{\rho}u\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\ dS(y)\right|^{\beta}dx \leq$$

$$c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}\left||u|^{\rho}u\Delta u\right|^{\beta}dx + c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}\left||u|^{\rho}u\nabla u\right|^{\beta}dx \leq$$

$$c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}\left||u|^{\rho}u\Delta u\right|^{\beta}dx + \varepsilon\int\limits_{\Omega}\left||u|^{\rho}|\nabla u|^2\right|^{\beta}dx + c_2(\varepsilon)\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{(\rho+2)\beta}dx.$$

Consequently

$$I_2(r) \leq c_1\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta}|\Delta u|^{\beta}dx + \varepsilon\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}|\nabla u|^{2\beta}dx + c_2(\varepsilon)\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+2\beta}dx. \tag{3.21}$$

where c_1,c_2 are positive quantities not dependend on r. Choosing sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < 1$, then substituting the right side of (3.21) into (3.20) and passing to the limit by $r \searrow 0$ in the obtained inequality we get the desired inequality (3.15). $\square$

Proposition 2 and Lemma 1 imply

Corollary 2. *Under the conditions of Lemma 1 the inequality*

$$\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha}|\nabla u|^{2\beta}dx \leq c\int\limits_{\Omega}|u|^{\alpha+\beta}|\Delta u|^{\beta}dx \tag{3.22}$$

holds with $c = c(\alpha,\beta)$ that is not dependent on u.

Our next goal is considering relations between the spaces $W_{\beta}^{2}(\Omega)$ and $.S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$. We start with definition of the second order Sobolev space:

$$W_{\beta}^{2}(\Omega) \equiv \left\{u \in L_1(\Omega)\ \mid u, D_i u, D_i D_j u \in L_{\beta}(\Omega),\ \ i,j = \overline{1,n}\right\}.$$

It is well known ([**4**]) that

$$W_{\beta}^{2}(\Omega) \equiv \left\{u \in L_1(\Omega)\ \middle| u, D_i^2 u \in L_{\beta}(\Omega),\ i = \overline{1,n}\right\}.$$

Moreover, for sufficiently smooth domains ([**1, 4**]).

$$W_{\beta}^{2}(\Omega) \cap \overset{0}{W}{}_{\beta}^{1}(\Omega) \equiv \{u\ \mid \Delta u \in L_{\beta}(\Omega),\ u\,|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\,\}$$

We also define the following class of functions

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Delta\circ\eta,L_{\beta}(\Omega)}\equiv\left\{u\;\middle|\;\Delta\circ\ \eta\left(u\right)\in L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right),\ \eta\left(u\right)\equiv\left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}u\right\}. \tag{3.23}$$

Now, we are ready to compare spaces defined in (3.5) and (3.23)

Lemma 2. *Let* $\alpha\geq 0$, $\alpha_1>-1$, $\beta_1\geq\beta\geq\frac{\beta_1}{2}\geq 1$, $\beta>\frac{n}{n-1}$ *be some numbers,* $\alpha+\beta=\alpha_1+\beta_1$, *(if* $\beta_1=2\beta$ *then* $\alpha>\beta-1$*) and* $\Omega\subset\Re^n$, $n\geq 1$, *be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary* $\partial\Omega$. *Then, the following inclusion*

$$\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)=S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\cap\left\{u\mid\ u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\right\}\subseteq\mathcal{M}_{\Delta\circ\eta,L_{\beta}(\Omega)}\cap\left\{u\mid\ u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\right\}$$

takes place.

Proof. Let $u\in\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$ be an arbitrary function. Then, according to (3.23) $\eta_1\left(u\right)\equiv\left|u\left(x\right)\right|^{\frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1}}u\left(x\right)\in\overset{0}{W}{}^1_{\beta_1}\left(\Omega\right)$ as far as $u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\Longleftrightarrow\eta_1\left(u\right)\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0$, and $\left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \Delta u\in L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$. Moreover, if $\alpha_1>0$ then $u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\Longrightarrow\frac{\partial}{\partial n}\eta_1\left(u\right)\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0$.

Under the conditions of Lemma, according to (3.22) and (3.11), the inequality

$$\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|u\right|^{\alpha_1}\left|\nabla u\right|^{\beta_1}dx\leq c\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|u\right|^{\alpha}\left|\Delta u\right|^{\beta}dx$$

takes place with $c=c\left(\alpha,\beta,\alpha_1,\beta_1\right)$ that is not dependent on u.

Taking this and Corollary 2 into account we conclude

$$\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\equiv\left\{u\left(x\right)\;\middle|\;\left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \Delta u\in L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\right\}\cap\left\{u\mid\ u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\right\}, \tag{3.24}$$

On the other hand, the definition (3.23) implies that $u\in\mathcal{M}_{\Delta\circ\eta,L_{\beta}(\Omega)}$ is equivalent to $\Delta v\equiv\Delta\eta\left(u\right)\in L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$. Indeed, using (3.6) and estimating $L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$ of Δv we get

$$\left\|\Delta v\right\|^{\beta}_{L_{\beta}(\Omega)}=\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \Delta u+\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\ \left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}-2}\ u\ \left|\nabla u\right|^{2}\right|^{\beta}dx\leq$$

$$c\left\{\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\ \Delta u\right|^{\beta}dx+\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|\ \left|u\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}-1}\ \left|\nabla u\right|^{2}\right|^{\beta}dx\right\}.$$

Taking the inequality (3.22) and the equivalence (3.24) into account we obtain

$$\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subseteq\mathcal{M}_{\Delta\circ\eta,L_{\beta}(\Omega)}\cap\left\{u\mid\ u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\right\}$$

□

Corollary 3. *Under the conditions of Lemma 2 the implication*

$$u\in\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\Longrightarrow v\equiv\eta\left(u\right)\in W^{2}_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\cap\overset{0}{W}{}^{1}_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$$

holds.

Proof. If $v\left(x\right)\equiv\eta\left(u\right)\equiv\left|u\left(x\right)\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}u\left(x\right)$ then $\nabla v\left(x\right)\equiv\left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}+1\right)\left|u\left(x\right)\right|^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}\nabla u\left(x\right)$ and (3.6) takes place for Δv.

According to mentioned above, the inclusion $v\equiv\eta\left(u\right)\in W^{2}_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\cap\overset{0}{W}{}^{1}_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$ is equivalent to $\Delta v=\Delta\circ\eta\left(u\right)\in L_{\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$, as far as $u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\ \Longleftrightarrow\ \eta\left(u\right)\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0$ (moreover, if $\alpha>0$ then $u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\Longrightarrow\frac{\partial}{\partial n}\eta\left(u\right)\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0$). This implies that

$\eta\left(u\right)\in W_{\beta}^{2}\left(\Omega\right)\cap\overset{0}{W}{}_{\beta}^{1}\left(\Omega\right)$ is equivalent to $u\in M_{\Delta\circ\eta,L_{\beta}(\Omega)}\cap\{u\mid u\left|_{\partial\Omega}\right.=0\}$ Therefore, taking the lemma into account we conclude the desired implication. □

Notation 1. *If parameters* $\alpha,\alpha_{1}\geq 0$, $\beta,\beta_{1},p,p_{0},p_{1}\geq 1$ *satisfy certain conditions some relations between spaces* $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$, $S_{1,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)$, $L_{p}\left(\Omega\right)$, $P_{p_{0},p_{1}}\left(0,T;X;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\right)$, $L_{p}\left(0,T;S_{1,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ *can be obtained according to their definitions. More precise inclusion and compactness results for them can be proved on the way that is similar to our earlier works* [**17, 18, 19, 20**]. *Here, we are presenting some of such type of results.*

Theorem 3. *Let* $\alpha,\alpha_{1}\geq 0$, $\beta>\frac{n}{n-1},\beta_{1}\geq 1$ *be such numbers that* $\frac{\alpha_{1}+\beta_{1}}{\alpha+\beta}\geq\beta\beta_{1}^{-1}$ *and* $\alpha\beta_{1}\geq\alpha_{1}\beta$, $\alpha>\beta-1$ *Then* $\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subset S_{1,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)$.

The proof follows from the inequality

$$\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|u\right|^{\alpha_{1}}\left|\nabla u\right|^{\beta_{1}}dx\leq c\left(\varepsilon\right)\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|u\right|^{\alpha}\left|\Delta u\right|^{\beta}dx+\varepsilon\left(\int\limits_{\Omega}\left|u\right|^{s}dx\right)^{\frac{\alpha+\beta}{s}},$$

where $s=s\left(\alpha,\alpha_{1},\beta,\beta_{1}\right)\leq\alpha+\beta$, that can be derived by using the inequalities (3.10), (3.11), (3.15) and (3.22) (for details refer to [**18, 19**]).

Remark 2. *Note that it is not difficult to verify that if* $\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\alpha_{1}+\beta_{1}}\geq 1$, $\beta\geq\beta_{1}$ *and* $\frac{n(\alpha_{1}+\beta_{1})}{n-\beta_{1}}\geq p$, $n>\beta_{1}$ *then the following inclusions*

$$S_{1,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subseteq S_{1,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)\subset L_{p}\left(\Omega\right),\quad S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subseteq S_{\Delta,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)$$

take place. Moreover, arguments similar to those that express relations between the considered and Sobolev spaces show that the inclusion $S_{1,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subset L_{p}\left(\Omega\right)$ *and consequently,* $\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\subset L_{p}\left(\Omega\right)$ *are compact (for detail one can refer to* [**18, 19, 20**]*).*

Corollary 4. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3 are fulfilled. Then, the following inclusions*

$$P_{p_{0},p_{1}}\left(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right);X\right)\subseteq P_{\widetilde{p}_{0},\widetilde{p}_{1}}\left(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right);\widetilde{X}\right),$$

$$P_{p_{0},p_{1}}\left(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right);X\right)\subset L_{p}\left(0,T;S_{1,\alpha_{1},\beta_{1}}\left(\Omega\right)\right),$$

hold if $X\subseteq\widetilde{X}$, *and* $p_{0}\geq\widetilde{p}_{0}\geq 1,p_{1}\geq\widetilde{p}_{1}\geq 1$, $p_{1}\geq p\geq 1$,

Remark 3. *If* $\alpha\geq 0$, $\frac{\alpha_{1}}{\beta_{1}}>-1$, $\frac{1}{2}\beta_{1}=\beta>\frac{n}{n-1}$ *such numbers that* $\alpha+\beta=\alpha_{1}+\beta_{1}$, $\alpha>\beta-1$, *then*

$$S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\iff\left\{u\left(x\right)\Big|\ \eta\left(u\right)\equiv\left|u\right|^{\rho}u\in W_{\beta}^{2}\left(\Omega\right)\ \ \rho=\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right\},$$

i.e.

$$u\in S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)\Longrightarrow v\equiv\eta\left(u\right)\equiv\left|u\right|^{\rho}u\in W_{\beta}^{2}\left(\Omega\right)\Longrightarrow$$

$$u\equiv\eta^{-1}\left(v\right)\equiv\left|v\right|^{-\frac{\rho}{\rho+1}}v\in S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}\left(\Omega\right)$$

under the conditions (see, [**13**] *and also* [**18, 19**]*) that all operations make a seinse.*

Furthermore, note that $S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ *and* $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ *are metric spaces (*[**18, 19, 20**]*) with the corresponding metrics of the form:*

$$d_{S_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)}(u;v) \equiv \|\eta(u)-\eta(v)\|_{W^1_\beta(\Omega)}^{(\rho+1)^{-1}}, \quad \eta(\tau)\equiv|\tau|^\rho\tau, \rho=\frac{\alpha}{\beta}, \alpha\geq 0, \beta>1,$$

$$d_{S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)}(u;v) \equiv \|\eta_1(u)-\eta_1(v)\|_{W^1_{\beta_1}(\Omega)}^{(\rho_1+1)^{-1}} + \||u|^\rho\Delta u-|v|^\rho\Delta v\|_{L_\beta(\Omega)}^{(\rho+1)^{-1}},$$

where $\rho_1=\frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1}$, $\eta_1(\tau)\equiv|\tau|^{\rho_1}\tau$, *and* $\alpha_1+\beta_1=\alpha+\beta$ *(see (2.1)).*

Moreover, it is not difficult to see that the metrics of spaces $\overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ *and* $\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ *have the form:*

$$d_{\overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)}(u;v) \equiv \|\||u|^\rho\nabla u-|v|^\rho\nabla v|\|_{L_\beta(\Omega)}^{(\rho+1)^{-1}};$$

$$d_{\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)}(u;v) \equiv \||u|^\rho\Delta u-|v|^\rho\Delta v\|_{L_\beta(\Omega)}^{(\rho+1)^{-1}}$$

correspondently.

Based on Theorem 3, Corollary 4 and Embedding Theorems for the Sobolev spaces we prove the following:

Theorem 4. *Let* $\alpha,\alpha_1\geq 0$, $\beta>\frac{n}{n-1}$, $\beta_1\geq 1$ *be such numbers that* $\beta_1<\frac{n\beta}{n-\beta}$, $\beta<n$, $\alpha_1+\beta_1<\frac{n(\alpha+\beta)}{n-\beta}$ *and* $\alpha\beta_1\geq\alpha_1\beta$, $\alpha>\beta-1$. *Then, the inclusion*

$$\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)\subset\overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)$$

is compact.

Proof. Since $u\in\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$, we have $\eta(u)\equiv v\in W^2_\beta(\Omega)\cap\overset{0}{W}{}^1_\beta(\Omega)$ and $u\in\overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)\Longleftrightarrow\eta_1(u)\equiv v\in\overset{0}{W}{}^1_{\beta_1}(\Omega)$ $(\eta_1(u)\equiv|u|^{\rho_1}u,\ \rho_1=\frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1})$. Moreover, as far as $W^2_\beta(\Omega)\subset W^{\ 1}_{\beta_1}(\Omega)$ is compact for $\beta_1<\frac{n\beta}{n-\beta}$, we get the compactness of the inclusion $\eta(G)\subset\overset{0}{W}{}^1_{\beta_1}(\Omega)$ for any bounded subset G from $\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$. This implies the desired statement □

Corollary 5. *If* $0<\rho\leq 2$, *then* $\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega)\subset\overset{0}{W}{}^1_p(\Omega)$, $p=\rho+2$.

Mentioned above and known results ([**10, 11, 18, 19**]) allow us to prove the the compact embeddings for the following vector spaces: $L_p\left(0,T;S_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)\right)$, $P_{1,p_0,p_1}\left(0,T;S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega);X\right)$. We need the following

Lemma 3. *Let* $\alpha,\alpha_1,\alpha_2\geq 0$, $\beta,\beta_1,\beta_2\geq 1$, $2\beta\geq\widetilde{\beta}\geq 1$ *be such numbers that* $\alpha+\beta=\alpha_1+\beta_1=\alpha_2+\beta_2$, $\beta_1<\beta<\beta_2$, $1\leq\widetilde{\beta_1}<\widetilde{\beta}<\widetilde{\beta_2}$. *Then, for any* $\varepsilon>0$ *there exists* $c(\varepsilon)>0$ *such that the inequality*

$$[u]_{S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}}\leq\varepsilon[u]_{S_{\Delta,\alpha_2,\beta_2}}+c(\varepsilon)[u]_{S_{\Delta,\alpha_1,\beta_1}},\ \forall u\in S_{\Delta,\alpha_2,\beta_2}(\Omega)$$

holds.

The proof is obvious.

Lemma 4. *Let $\alpha, \alpha_1 \geq 0$, $\beta, \beta_0, p \geq 1$, $\frac{\beta_1}{2} \geq \beta > \frac{n}{n-1}$ be such numbers that $\beta_0 < \frac{n\beta}{n-\beta}$, $\beta < n$, $\alpha_0 + \beta_0 < \frac{n(\alpha+\beta)}{n-\beta}$ and $\alpha\beta_0 \geq \alpha_0\beta$, $\alpha > \beta - 1$, $p \leq \alpha + \beta$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the inequality*

$$d_{S_{1,\alpha_0,\beta_0}}(u; v) \leq \varepsilon \left([u]_{S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}} + [v]_{S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}} \right) + c(\varepsilon) \|u - v\|_{L_p}, \ \forall u, v \in S_{\Delta,\alpha_2,\beta_2}(\Omega)$$

holds

The proof is similar to the proof of the same type results from [**6, 10, 18, 19**] and is based on the compactness of the inclusion $S_{\Delta,\alpha_2,\beta_2}(\Omega) \subset S_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega) \subset L_p(\Omega)$.

These lemmas allow us to get the following compactness

Theorem 5. *Let $S_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)$, $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega)$ and X be spaces defined above and $S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega) \subset S_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)$ is compact. Let $\alpha_1 \geq 0$, $\beta, \beta_1, p, p_0, p_1 \geq 1$ be such numbers that $\alpha + \beta = p = p_1$, $\alpha\beta_1 \geq \alpha_1\beta$, $\beta > \frac{n}{n-1}$, $\alpha > \beta - 1$. Then, the inclusion $P_{1,p_0,p_1}(0, T; S_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega); X) \subset L_p\left(0, T; S_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)\right)$ is compact.*

The proof is similar to the proof of the same type of results from [**10, 17, 18, 19, 20**]. Therefore, we are not providing it here. The other compactness theorems similar to Theorem 4 and Lemma 3 can also be proved , but we are not presenting them here, as well. However, if it would be neccessary, we are going to use those theorems for the spaces $P_{1,p_0,p_1}\left(0, T; \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega); X\right)$, $L_p\left(0, T; \overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)\right)$ under the corresponding conditions on parameters α, α_1, β, β_1, p, p_0, p_1 and refer reader to our earlier works [**17, 18, 19, 20**] for further details.

4. The Proof of the Solvability Theorem

Now we can lead the proof by using Theorem 2 (Corollary 1), and in order to apply it we introduce the following spaces and mappings:

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \equiv \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega), \quad X_0 \equiv W^2_p(\Omega) \cap \overset{0}{W}{}^1_p(\Omega), \qquad Y \equiv L_q(\Omega), \ X \equiv L_p(\Omega),$$

$$f(u) \equiv -|u|^\rho \Delta u + b_0 |u|^{\mu+1}, \quad L \equiv -\Delta, \quad L_0 \equiv \nabla, \qquad Y^* \equiv L_p(Q), \ p = \rho + 2$$

$$\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0, T; \mathcal{M}_0, Y) \equiv \underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0, T; \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega); L_q(\Omega)\right) \cap L^\infty\left(0, T; \overset{0}{W}{}^1_2(\Omega)\right)$$

where

$$\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0, T; \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega); L_q(\Omega)\right) \equiv L_p\left(0, T; \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega)\right) \cap \underset{0}{W}{}^1_q(0, T; L_q(\Omega)).$$

It not is difficult to see that

$$\langle f(u), Lu \rangle \equiv \left\langle -|u|^\rho \Delta u + b_0 |u|^{\mu+1}, -\Delta u \right\rangle = \int_\Omega |u|^\rho (\Delta u)^2 dx + \int_\Omega b_0 |u|^{\mu+1} \Delta u dx$$

for any $u \in W^2_p(\Omega) \cap \overset{0}{W}{}^1_p(\Omega)$ and $u \in L_p\left(0, T; W^2_p(\Omega) \cap \overset{0}{W}{}^1_p(\Omega)\right)$.

Taking into account the embedding theorems from Section 3, the last equality implies that, if $\min\left\{0, \frac{\rho}{2}-1\right\} \leq \mu < \rho \leq 2$ or $\frac{\rho}{2}-1 \leq \mu < \rho$ and $b_0 \in R^1$ then

$$\int\limits_0^T \left\langle f\left(u\right), Lu\right\rangle dt \geq \left(1-\varepsilon\right) \int\limits_0^T \int\limits_\Omega \left|u\right|^\rho \left(\Delta u\right)^2 dxdt - c_1\left(\varepsilon\right) =$$

$$\left(1-\varepsilon\right)\int\limits_0^T \left[u\right]^{\rho+2}_{\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega)} dt - c_1\left(\varepsilon\right) \equiv \varphi\left(\left[u\right]_{L_{\rho+2}\left(\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\right)}\right) \left[u\right]_{L_{\rho+2}\left(\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\right)},$$

where $c_0 > 0$, $c_1, \varepsilon \geq 0$, and ε is a sufficiently small nonnegative number.

Furthermore, it is obvious that $\int\limits_0^t \left\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}, Lu\right\rangle d\tau \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left\|\left|\nabla u\left(t\right)\right|\right\|^2_{L_2}$ for any $u \in \underset{0}{W}{}^{1}_{p}\left(0,T;X_0\right)$ and almost any $t \in (0,T]$. Moreover, $\int\limits_0^T \left\langle w, Lw\right\rangle d\tau \equiv \left\|\left|\nabla w\right|\right\|^2_{L_2(Q)}$ for any $w \in L_p\left(0,T;X_0\right)$, where $w \equiv \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} \in L_p\left(0,T;X_0\right)$.

Using the generalized coercivity of pair f and $-\Delta$ on $L_p\left(0,T; W^2_p\left(\Omega\right) \cap \overset{0}{W}{}^1_p\left(\Omega\right)\right) \cap W^1_q\left(0,T;L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ the following apriori estimations for a solution $u\left(t,x\right)$ of considered problem are obtained in a common way:

$$\left[u\right]_{L_p\left(\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\right)} \leq c\left(\left|b_0\right|, \left\|h\right\|_{L_2\left(W^1_2(\Omega)\right)}, \rho, \mu\right), \quad p = \rho+2,\ q = p'$$

and

$$\left\|u\right\|_{W^1_q(L_q)\cap L^\infty\left(W^1_2\right)} \leq c\left(\left|b_0\right|, \left\|h\right\|_{L_2\left(W^1_2(\Omega)\right)}, \rho, \mu\right).$$

Thus, each possible solution $u\left(t,x\right)$ of the considered problem belongs to a bounded subset of

$$L_p\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right)\right) \cap W^1_q\left(0,T;L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right) \cap L^\infty\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}^1_2\left(\Omega\right)\right),$$

and, consequently, the solutions belong to a bounded subset of $P_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right);L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ and $L^\infty\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}^1_2\left(\Omega\right)\right)$.

To apply Theorem 2 (Corollary 1) it remains to show that f is a weakly compact (continuous) mapping from $P_1\left(Q_T\right) \equiv P_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}\left(\Omega\right);L_q\left(\Omega\right)\right) \cap L^\infty\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}^1_2\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ into $L_q\left(Q_T\right)$. To this end, it is enough to use the following expressions:

$$\left|u\right|^{\rho-2}\ u\ \left|\nabla u\right|^2 = \left(\left|u\right|^{\gamma\rho}\ \nabla u\right)\cdot\left(\left|u\right|^{(1-\gamma)\rho-2}\ u\ \nabla u\right), \tag{4.1}$$

(4.2)

$$\left|u\right|^{\rho-2}\ u\ \left|\nabla u\right|^2 = \frac{1}{\rho\left(\rho+1\right)\left(1-\theta\right)}\ \Delta\left(\left|u\right|^\rho u\right) - \frac{1}{\rho\left(\theta\rho+1\right)\left(1-\theta\right)}\left|u\right|^{(1-\theta)\rho}\ \Delta\left(\left|u\right|^{\theta\rho} u\right),$$

because of

$$\left|u\right|^\rho\ \Delta u = \frac{1}{\rho+1}\ \Delta\left(\left|u\right|^\rho u\right) - \rho\left|u\right|^{\rho-2}\ u\ \left|\nabla u\right|^2,$$

where γ is a number from condition 4) if $\rho \geq 1$, and θ is such a number that $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta < 1$ if $0 < \rho \leq 2$. Particularly, if $\theta = \frac{2}{3}$ it is sufficient to use the expression:

$$|u|^{\rho-2} \ u \ |\nabla u|^2 = \frac{3}{\rho\,(\rho+1)}\ \Delta\left(|u|^{\rho} u\right) - \frac{3}{\rho}\,|u|^{\frac{\rho}{3}}\ \nabla\cdot\left(|u|^{\frac{2\rho}{3}}\,\nabla u\right)$$

then $|u|^{\frac{2\rho}{3}}\,\Delta u \in L_{\frac{2(\rho+2)}{\rho+4}}(Q)$ and $|u|^{\frac{\rho}{3}} \in L_{\frac{2(\rho+2)}{\rho}}(Q)$.

Thus, according to the embedding theorems mentioned above, the solution $u(t,x) \in P_{1,p_0,q_0}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\alpha,\beta}(\Omega);L_q(\Omega)\right)$ and $u(t,x) \in L_p\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{1,\alpha_1,\beta_1}(\Omega)\right)$, if the parameters $\alpha_1 \geq 0$, $\beta,\beta_1,p,p_0,p_1 \geq 1$, $\alpha > \beta-1$ satisfy one of the following conditions: 1) $\alpha_1 = (\rho-1)\,q$, $\beta_1 = 2q$, $p = \rho+2$, $q = p' = \frac{\rho+2}{\rho+1}$; 2) $\alpha = \rho$, $\beta = 2$, $p_0 = \rho+2, q_0 = q$; 3) $\alpha = s\beta$, $\beta > 1$, $p_0 = (s+1)\,\beta$, $q_0 = \beta$, $1 \leq s \leq \frac{3\rho-2}{4}$; or 4) $\alpha = \gamma\rho\beta$, $\beta = \frac{\rho+2}{\gamma\rho+1}$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < 1$, $p_0 = \rho+2$, $q_0 = q$.

Therefore, if a sequence $\{u_m\} \subset P_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega);L_q(\Omega)\right)$ converges weakly to $u \in P_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega);L_q(\Omega)\right)$ in $P_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega);L_q(\Omega)\right)$ then, according to the compactness theorem from Section 3, one of the factors in (4.1) and in the second term of (4.2) converges weakly and the another one converges strongly in the corresponding spaces. This implies that $f(u_m) \rightharpoonup f(u)$ in $L_q(Q)$

Hence, all conditions of Corollary 1 are fulfilled. Applying it to the considered problem (1.1)-(1.3) we obtain the statement of Theorem 1.

Remark 4. *The solvability theorem such as Theorem 1 for the problem (1.1)-(1.3), but with $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$ for $u_0 \in \overset{0}{S}_{\Delta,\rho,2}(\Omega)$ is also valid and can be proved as in* [**19**] *(or* [**18**]*).*

Remark 5. *The problem (1.1)-(1.3) can also be considered with the term $b(t,x,u)$ instead of $b_0\,|u|^{\mu+1}$. In this case, it is enough to assume holding of the following conditions: The function $b(t,x,u)$ is the Caratheodory function on $Q \times R^1$, there exist functions $b_0(t,x), b_1(t,x) \geq 0$ and number $\mu \geq 0$ such that $\min\left\{0,\frac{\rho}{2}-1\right\} \leq \mu < \rho$ and*

$$|b(t,x,u)| \leq b_0(t,x)\,|u|^{\mu+1} + b_1(t,x)\,,$$

where

$$b_0 \in L^{\infty}(Q)\,,\ b_1 \in L_2\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}_2^1(\Omega)\right) \qquad \text{if } \mu \geq \frac{\rho}{2}-1;$$

$b \in L^{\infty}\left(0,T;W^{1,\infty}(\Omega);C^1\left(R^1\right)\right)$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} |D_i b(t,x,u)| &\leq \widetilde{b}_0(t,x)\,|u|^{\mu+1} + b_1(t,x)\,,\ i = \overline{1,n}, \\ |b_{\xi}(t,x,\xi)| &\leq b_2(t,x)\,|\xi|^{\mu} + b_3(t,x)\,, \end{aligned}$$

$$\widetilde{b}_0, b_2 \in L^{\infty}(Q)\,,\ \widetilde{b}_1 \in L_2(Q)\,,\ b_3 \in L_2\left(0,T;\overset{0}{W}{}_2^1(\Omega)\right),$$

$q = p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$, *and* $p = \rho+2$ *if* $\mu < \frac{\rho}{2}-1$.

5. On a Behavior of the Solutions of Problem (1.1)-(1.3)

In this section we investigate the behavior of solutions for different $\mu \geq 0$: $\min\left\{0, \frac{\rho}{2}-1\right\} \leq \mu < \rho$ and $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$, and in the case $\mu = \rho$.

THEOREM 6. *Let* $\min\left\{0, \frac{\rho}{2}-1\right\} \leq \mu < \rho$, $u_0 \in \overset{0}{W}{}_p^1(\Omega)$, $h \in L^\infty\left(R_+^1; L_q(\Omega)\right)$ *and* $\|h\|_{L_q}(t) \leq C_0$. *Then, the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.3) with the initial condition* $u(0,x) = u_0(x)$ *satisfies the inequality*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \left(\frac{C + C_2\|h\|_{L^\infty(L_q)}^q}{C_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{p}} + \left(C_1\frac{\rho}{2}t\right)^{-\frac{2}{\rho}}, \tag{5.1}$$

i.e. the solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.3) remains bounded as $t \nearrow \infty$, *where* $C_j = C_j\left(\rho, \mu, b_0, C_0, \|u_0\|_{\overset{0}{W}{}_p^1}, mes\ \Omega\right)$.

PROOF. Consider the functional

$$\Phi(t) \equiv \Phi(u(t)) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |u(t)|^2\,dx \equiv \frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^2.$$

If $u(t)$ is a solution of the problem (1.1)-(1.3) then, the function $\Phi(t)$ has the property

$$\Phi'(t) = \langle u', u\rangle = \left\langle |u|^\rho \Delta u - b_0|u|^{\mu+1} + h, u\right\rangle = -(\rho+1)\langle |u|^\rho \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle -$$

$$\langle b_0|u|^\mu u, u\rangle + \langle h, u\rangle \leq -(\rho+1)\left\||u|^{\frac{\rho}{2}}\nabla u\right\|_{L_2}^2 + |b_0|\,\|u\|_{L_{\mu+2}}^{\mu+2} + |\langle h, u\rangle|.$$

Applying the results of Section 3 we get

$$\Phi'(t) \leq -(\rho+1)\left\|\left|u\right|^{\frac{\rho}{2}}\nabla u\right\|_{L_2}^2 + |b_0|\,\|u\|_{L_{\mu+2}}^{\mu+2} + \|u\|_{L_p}\|h\|_{L_q} \leq$$

$$-(\rho+1)\frac{(\rho+2)^2}{4}\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^{\frac{\rho}{2}}u\right)\right\|_{L_2}^2 + 2\varepsilon\|u\|_{L_p}^p + C(\varepsilon)\left(1 + \|h\|_{L_q}^q\right) \leq$$

$$-C_0\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^{\frac{\rho}{2}}u\right)\right\|_{L_2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\left(1 + \|h\|_{L_q}^q\right) \leq$$

$$-\widetilde{C}_0\|u\|_{Lp}^p + C(\varepsilon)\left(1 + \|h\|_{L_q}^q\right) \leq -C_1\|u\|_{L_2}^p + C(\varepsilon) + k(\varepsilon)\|h\|_{L^\infty(L_q)}^q$$

because of $\overset{0}{S}_{1,\rho,2}(\Omega) \subset L_p(\Omega) \subset L_2(\Omega)$ with the corresponding inequalities. Hence we have

$$\Phi'(t) + C_1(\Phi(t))^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C + C_2\|h\|_{L^\infty(L_q)}^q, \tag{5.2}$$

where $C = C\left(\rho, \mu, b_0, C_0, \|u_0\|_{\overset{0}{W}{}_p^1},\ mes\ \Omega\right)$, $C_1 = C_1\left(\rho, \mu, b_0, C_0, \|u_0\|_{\overset{0}{W}{}_p^1},\ mes\ \Omega\right)$ and $\Phi(0) = \|u_0\|_{L_2}^2$.

Then, applying the following form of Gronwall's lemma (Lemma 5) to the inequality (5.2), which was proved by Ghidaglia, with $y(t) \equiv \Phi(t)$, $\theta = C_1$, $\eta = C + C_2\|h\|_{L_q}^q$, $l = \frac{p}{2}$ we obtain the inequality (5.1). □

LEMMA 5. *([**21**]) Let $y(t)$ be a positive absolutely continuous function on R^1_+ which satisfies*

$$y' + \theta y^l \leq \eta, \quad l > 1, \theta > 0, \eta \geq 0.$$

Then, for $t \geq 0$,

$$y(t) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{l}} + \left(\theta(l-1)t\right)^{-\frac{1}{l-1}}.$$

Now, consider the following problem:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - |u|^{\rho} \Delta u - b(x)|u|^{\rho+1} = 0, \quad (t,x) \in Q, \tag{5.3}$$

$$u(0,x) = u_0(x) \geq 0, \quad u \mid_{\Gamma} = 0\ ,\ \Gamma \equiv [0,T] \times \partial\Omega, \tag{5.4}$$

Let λ_1 be the first eigenvalue and $v_1(x)$ be the corresponding eigenfunction of the problem

$$-\Delta v = \lambda v, \quad x \in \Omega \quad v \mid_{\partial\Omega} = 0\ .$$

LEMMA 6. *Let $\rho, b(x) > 0$, $u_0(x) \geq 0$ and $\mu = \rho$, moreover $u_0 \in L_2(\Omega)$, $\|b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c$, $c = c(\Omega) > 0$, $\Omega \subset R^n$ be as above. Then, if $M = \frac{c(\rho+2)^2}{4(\rho+1)} < \lambda_1$ then a solution of the problem (5.3)-(5.4) remains bounded as $t \nearrow \infty$, i.e. the inequality of the type (5.1) takes place also.*

PROOF. Let $\rho, b(x) > 0$ and $\mu = \rho$. Then, using the previous reasoning we get

$$\Phi'(t) = \langle u', u\rangle = -(\rho+1)\langle |u|^{\rho} \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle + \left\langle b(x)|u|^{\rho+1}, u\right\rangle \leq$$

$$-(\rho+1)\frac{4}{(\rho+2)^2}\left\|\nabla\left(|u|^{\frac{\rho}{2}} u\right)\right\|^2_{L_2} + \|b\|_{L^\infty}\left\||u|^{\frac{\rho}{2}} u\right\|^2_{L_2}.$$

Since $M < \lambda_1$ a solution remains bounded when $t \nearrow \infty$ as in the previous case. □

REMARK 6. *Suppose $b(x) > \lambda_1$ and $u(t,x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ or on a subdomain $\widetilde{\Omega} \subset\subset \Omega$. Note that this case was studied under various conditions in* [**7, 24, 22, 25**]. *In our consideration we study the problem (5.3)-(5.4) in the following way:*

If $u(t,x) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ then, the equation (5.3) can be represented as

$$u^{-\rho}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta u - b(x)u = 0, \quad (t,x) \in Q.$$

Hence, we have

$$\left\langle u^{-\rho}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, v_1\right\rangle = \langle \Delta u + b(x)u, v_1\rangle \Longrightarrow \left\langle u^{-\rho}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, v_1\right\rangle = -\lambda_1\langle u, v_1\rangle + \langle b(x)u, v_1\rangle$$

or

$$\left\langle u^{-\rho}\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, v_1\right\rangle \geq \delta\langle u, v_1\rangle, \quad (b(x) - \lambda_1) \geq \delta > 0 \Longrightarrow (1-\rho)^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left\langle u^{1-\rho}, v_1\right\rangle \geq \delta\langle u, v_1\rangle.$$

The blow-up result can be obtained from here as in [**25**] *(see* [**7, 24, 22, 25**] *and references therein).*

6. Appendixes

6.1. Appendix A. Let X, Y be a locally convex vector topological spaces, $B \subseteq Y$ be a Banach space and $g : D(g) \subseteq X \longrightarrow Y$. Let's introduce the following subset of X

$$\mathcal{M}_{gB} \equiv \{x \in X \mid g(x) \in B,\ \operatorname{Im} g \cap B \neq \varnothing\}.$$

Definition 1. *A subset $\mathcal{M} \subseteq X$ is called a pn−space (i.e. pseudonormed space) if S is a topological space and there is a function $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow R^1_+ \equiv [0, \infty)$ (which is called p−norm of $\mathcal{M}$) such that*

qn) $[x]_{\mathcal{M}} \geq 0$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x = 0 \Longrightarrow [x]_{\mathcal{M}} = 0$;

pn) $[x_1]_{\mathcal{M}} \neq [x_2]_{\mathcal{M}} \Longrightarrow x_1 \neq x_2$, for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, and $[x]_{\mathcal{M}} = 0 \Longrightarrow x = 0$;

The following conditions are often fulfilled in the spaces $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$.

N) There exist a convex function $\nu : R^1 \longrightarrow \overline{R^1_+}$ and number $K \in (0, \infty]$ such that $[\lambda x]_{\mathcal{M}} \leq \nu(\lambda)[x]_{\mathcal{M}}$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\lambda \in R^1$, $|\lambda| < K$, moreover, $\lim\limits_{|\lambda| \longrightarrow \lambda_j} \frac{\nu(\lambda)}{|\lambda|} = c_j$, $j = 0, 1$ where $\lambda_0 = 0$, $\lambda_1 = K$ and $c_0 = c_1 = 1$ or $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = \infty$, i.e. if $K = \infty$ then $\lambda x \in \mathcal{M}$ for any $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\lambda \in R^1$.

Let $g : D(g) \subseteq X \longrightarrow Y$ be such a mapping that $\mathcal{M}_{gB} \neq \varnothing$ and the following conditions are fulfilled

G_1) $g : D(g) \longleftrightarrow \operatorname{Im} g$ is a bijection and $g(0) = 0$;

G_2) there is a function $\nu : R^1 \longrightarrow \overline{R^1_+}$ satsfying condition N such that

$$\|g(\lambda x)\|_B \leq \nu(\lambda)\|g(x)\|_B,\ \forall x \in \mathcal{M}_{gB},\ \forall \lambda \in R^1;$$

If the mapping g satisfies conditions G_1 and G_2 then $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is a *pn*−space with *p*−norm defined in the following way: there is a one-to-one function $\psi : R^1_+ \longrightarrow R^1_+$, $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi, \psi^{-1} \in C^0$ such that $[x]_{\mathcal{M}_{gB}} \equiv \psi^{-1}(\|g(x)\|_B)$. In this case $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is a metric space with a metric: $d_{\mathcal{M}}(x_1; x_2) \equiv \|g(x_1) - g(x_2)\|_B$. Further, we consider just such type of *pn*−spaces.

Definition 2. *The pn−space $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is called weakly complete if $g(\mathcal{M}_{gB})$ is weakly closed in B. The pn-space $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is "reflexive" if each bounded weakly closed subset of $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is weakly compact in $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$.*

It is clear that if B is a reflexive Banach space and $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is a weakly complete *pn*−space, then $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is "reflexive". Moreover, if B is a separable Banach space, then $\mathcal{M}_{gB}$ is separable, also.

6.2. Appendix B. In the beginning we consider an operator equation

$$f(x) = y, \quad y \in Y, \tag{6.1}$$

where $f : D(f) \subseteq X \longrightarrow Y$ is a nonlinear bounded operator, and prove a general solvability theorem for it. It is clear that (6.1) is equivalent to the following functional equation:

$$\langle f(x), y^* \rangle = \langle y, y^* \rangle, \quad \forall y^* \in Y^*. \tag{6.2}$$

We consider the following conditions:

1) $f : \mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq D(f) \longrightarrow Y$ is a weakly compact (weakly "continuous") mapping, i.e. for any weakly convergence sequence $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{M}_0$ in $\mathcal{M}_0$ (i.e. $x_m \overset{\mathcal{M}_0}{\rightharpoonup} x_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$) there is a subsequence $\{x_{m_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \{x_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ such that $f(x_{m_k}) \overset{Y}{\rightharpoonup} f(x_0)$

weakly in Y (or for a general sequence if $\mathcal{M}_0$ not is separable space) and $\mathcal{M}_0$ be a weakly complete $pn-$space;

2) there exists a mapping $g : X_0 \subseteq X \longrightarrow Y^*$ and a continuous function $\varphi : R^1_+ \longrightarrow R^1$ nondecreasing for $\tau \geq \tau_0 \geq 0$ and $\varphi(\tau_1) > 0$ for a number $\tau_1 > 0$ such that it generates a "coercive" pair in a generalized sense with f on the topological space $X_1 \subseteq X_0 \cap \mathcal{M}_0$, i.e.

$$\langle f(x), g(x)\rangle \geq \varphi([x]_{\mathcal{M}_0})[x]_{\mathcal{M}_0}, \quad \forall x \in X_1,$$

where X_1 is such a topological space that $\overline{X_1}^{X_0} \equiv X_0$ and $\overline{X_1}^{\mathcal{M}_0} \equiv \mathcal{M}_0$, and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is a dual form of the pair (Y, Y^*), moreover, one of the following conditions (α) or (β) holds:

(α) if $g \equiv L$ is a linear continuous operator, then X_1 is a "reflexive" space (see [S3, S4]), $X_0 \equiv X_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0$ is a separable topological vector space which is dense in $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\ker L^* = \{0\}$.

(β) if g is a bounded operator (linear or nonlinear), then Y is a reflexive separable space, $g(X_1)$ contains an everywhere dense linear manifold of Y^* and g^{-1} is weakly compact (weakly continuous) operator from Y^* to $\mathcal{M}_0$.

Theorem 7. *Let conditions 1 and 2 hold. Then the equation (6.1) (or (6.2)) is solvable in $\mathcal{M}_0$ for any $y \in Y$ satisfying the following inequality: there exists $r > 0$ such that*

$$\varphi([x]_{\mathcal{M}_0})[x]_{\mathcal{M}_0} \geq \langle y, g(x)\rangle, \text{ for } \quad \forall x \in X_1 \quad \text{with} \quad [x]_{\mathcal{M}} \geq r. \tag{6.3}$$

Proof. Assume that the conditions 1 and 2 (α) are fulfilled and $y \in Y$ such that (6.3) holds. We are going to use Galerkin's approximation method. Let $\left\{x^k\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a complete system in the (separable) space $X_1 \equiv X_0$. Then, we are looking for approximate solutions in the form $x_m = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk}x^k$, where c_{mk} are unknown coefficients, that might be determined from the system of algebraic equations

$$\Phi_k(c_m) := \left\langle f(x_m), g\left(x^k\right)\right\rangle - \left\langle y, g\left(x^k\right)\right\rangle = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, ..., m \tag{6.4}$$

with $c_m \equiv (c_{m1}, c_{m2}, ..., c_{mm})$.

We observe that the mapping $\Phi(c_m) := (\Phi_1(c_m), \Phi_2(c_m), ..., \Phi_m(c_m))$ is continuous by virtue of condition 1. (6.4) implies the existence of such $r = r(\|y\|_Y) > 0$ that the "acute angle" condition is fulfilled for all x_m with $[x_m]_{\mathcal{M}_0} \geq r$, i.e. for any $c_m \in S^{R^m}_{r_1}(0) \subset R^m$, $r_1 \geq r$ the inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m}\langle\Phi_k(c_m), c_{mk}\rangle \equiv \left\langle f(x_m), g\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk}x^k\right)\right\rangle - \left\langle y, g\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk}x^k\right)\right\rangle =$$

$$\langle f(x_m), g(x_m)\rangle - \langle y, g(x_m)\rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall c_m \in \mathbb{R}^m, \|c_m\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} = r_1.$$

holds. The solvability of system (6.4) for each $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ follows from a well-known lemma on the "acute angle" ([**10, 6, 18**]), which is equivalent to the Brouwer's fixed-point theorem. Thus, the sequence $\{x_m \mid m \geq 1\}$ of the approximate solutions, that is contained in a bounded subset of the space $\mathcal{M}_0$. Further arguments are analogous to those from [**10, 19**] therefore we omit them. It remains to pass to the limit in (6.4) by m and use a weak convergency of a subsequence of the sequence $\{x_m \mid m \geq 1\}$, the weak compactness of the mapping f, and finally, the completeness of the system $\left\{x^k\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$in the space X_1.

Hence, we get the limit element $x_0 = w - \lim_{j \nearrow \infty} x_{m_j} \in \mathcal{M}_0$ that is a solution of the equation

$$\langle f(x_0), g(x) \rangle = \langle y, g(x) \rangle, \quad \forall x \in X_0, \tag{6.5}$$

or

$$\langle g^* \circ f(x_0), x \rangle = \langle g^* \circ y, x \rangle, \quad \forall x \in X_0. \tag{6.6}$$

In the second case, i.e. when the conditions 1 and 2 (β) are fulfilled and $y \in Y$ such that (6.3) holds, the approximate solutions suppose to be looked for in the form

$$x_m = g^{-1}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk} y_k^*\right) \equiv g^{-1}\left(y_{(m)}^*\right), \quad i.e.\ x_m = g^{-1}\left(y_{(m)}^*\right) \tag{6.7}$$

where $\{y_k^*\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset Y^*$ is a complete system in the (separable) space Y^* and belongs to $g(X_1)$. The unknown coefficients c_{mk}, might be determined from the system of algebraic equations

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_k(c_m) := \langle f(x_m), y_k^* \rangle - \langle y, y_k^* \rangle = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, ..., m \tag{6.8}$$

with $c_m \equiv (c_{m1}, c_{m2}, ..., c_{mm})$. Taking this and our conditions into account we get

$$\langle f(x_m), y_k^* \rangle - \langle y, y_k^* \rangle = \left\langle f\left(g^{-1}\left(y_{(m)}^*\right)\right), y_k^* \right\rangle - \langle y, y_k^* \rangle = 0, \tag{6.9}$$

for $k = 1, 2, ..., m$.

As it was observed above the mapping

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(c_m) := \left(\widetilde{\Phi}_1(c_m), \widetilde{\Phi}_2(c_m), ..., \widetilde{\Phi}_m(c_m)\right)$$

is continuous by virtue of the conditions 1 and 2(β). Also, (6.3) implies the existence of such $\widetilde{r} > 0$ that the "acute angle" condition is fulfilled for all $y_{(m)}^*$ with $\left\|y_{(m)}^*\right\|_{Y^*} \geq \widetilde{r}$, i.e. for any $c_m \in S_{r_1}^{R^m}(0) \subset R^m$, $\widetilde{r}_1 \geq \widetilde{r}$ the inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left\langle \widetilde{\Phi}_k(c_m), c_{mk} \right\rangle \equiv \left\langle f(x_m), \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk} y_k^* \right\rangle - \left\langle y, \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{mk} y_k^* \right\rangle =$$

$$\left\langle f\left(g^{-1}\left(y_{(m)}^*\right)\right), y_{(m)}^* \right\rangle - \left\langle y, y_{(m)}^* \right\rangle = \langle f(x_m), g(x_m) \rangle - \langle y, g(x_m) \rangle \geq 0,$$

$$\forall c_m \in \mathbb{R}^m, \|c_m\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} = \widetilde{r}_1.$$

holds by virtue of our conditions. Consequently, the solvability of system (6.8) (or (6.9)) for each $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ follows from the "acute angle" lemma as above. Thus, we obtained a sequence $\left\{y_{(m)}^* \mid m \geq 1\right\}$ of the approximate solutions, that is contained in a bounded subset of Y^*. This implies an existence of a subsequence $\left\{y_{(m_j)}^*\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ that convergences weakly in Y^*. Consequently, the sequence $\{x_{m_j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \equiv \left\{g^{-1}\left(y_{(m_j)}^*\right)\right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ converges weakly in the space $\mathcal{M}_0$ by vertue of the condition 2(β) (may be after passing to the subsequence). It remains to pass to the limit in (6.9) by j and use a weak convergency of the subsequence of the sequence $\left\{y_{(m)}^* \mid m \geq 1\right\}$, the weak compactness of mappings f and g^{-1}, and the completeness of the system $\{y_k^*\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$in the space Y^*.

Hence, we get a limit element $x_0 = w - \lim\limits_{j\nearrow\infty} x_{m_j} = w - \lim\limits_{j\nearrow\infty} g^{-1}\left(y^*_{(m_j)}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_0$ that is the solution of the equation

$$\langle f(x_0), y^*\rangle = \langle y, y^*\rangle, \quad \forall y^* \in Y^*. \tag{6.10}$$

Q.e.d. □

Remark 7. *It is obvious, that if there exists a function* $\psi : R^1_+ \longrightarrow R^1_+$, $\psi \in C^0$*such that* $\psi(\xi) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow \xi = 0$ *and the inequality* $\psi\left(\|x_1 - x_2\|_X\right) \leq \|f(x_1) - f(x_2)\|_Y$ *is fulfilled for all* $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}_0$, *then a solution of the equation (6.2) is unique.*

Corollary 6. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 7 are fulfilled and there is a continuous function* $\varphi_1 : R^1_+ \longrightarrow R^1_+$ *such that* $\|g(x)\|_{Y^*} \leq \varphi_1\left([x]_{\mathcal{M}_0}\right)$ *for any* $x \in X_0$ *and* $\varphi(\tau) \nearrow +\infty$ *and* $\frac{\varphi(\tau)\tau}{\varphi_1(\tau)} \nearrow +\infty$ *as* $\tau \nearrow +\infty$. *Then, the equation (6.2) is solvable in* $\mathcal{M}_0$ *for any* $y \in Y$.

6.3. Appendix C. Now, we are ready to provide the proof of Theorem 2. Let $\left\{x^k\right\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a complete system in the (separable) space X_0 and $\{\theta^s(t)\}_{s=1}^\infty$ be a complete system in the (separable) space $L_p(0,T)$, then $\left\{\theta^s(t)\, x^k\right\}_{s,k=1}^\infty$ is a complete system in the separable space $L_p(0,T;X_0)$.

Proof of the Theorem 2. We are going to use the method of elliptic regularization (see, for example, [**10**][3]). Namely, first we prove the solvability of the following auxiliary elliptic problem with a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$.

$$-\varepsilon\frac{d^2x_\varepsilon}{dt^2} + \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt} + f(t, x_\varepsilon(t)) = y(t), \tag{6.11}$$

$$x_\varepsilon(0) = 0, \quad \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt} \mid_{t=T} = 0, \ \varepsilon > 0. \tag{6.12}$$

A solution of the problem (6.11)-(6.12) would be understood as an element $x_\varepsilon(t) \in \underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y)$ that satisfies the following functional equation

$$\varepsilon\int\limits_0^T \left\langle \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}, \frac{dy^*}{dt}\right\rangle dt + \int\limits_0^T \left\langle \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}, y^*\right\rangle dt +$$

$$\int\limits_0^T \langle f(t, x_\varepsilon(t)), y^*\rangle\, dt = \int\limits_0^T \langle y, y^*\rangle\, dt \tag{6.13}$$

for any $y^* \in W^1_{q'}(0,T;Y^*) \cap \{y^*(t) \mid y^*(0) = 0\}$.

Lemma 7. *Under the conditions of Theorem 2 the equation (6.13) is solvable in the space* $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y)$ *for any* $y \in G$ *where* G *is defined in Theorem 2.*

---

[3] see, also, Soltanov K. N., Sprekels J. - Nonlinear equations in nonreflexive Banach spaces and fully nonlinear equations, Advances in Mathematical Sciences and Applications, 1999, v. 9, no. 2, 939-972.

The statement of this lemma follows from Theorem 7 of Appendix B (see, also [**18, 20**]). Indeed, the mapping generated by the considered problem (6.11)-(6.12) is weakly compact from $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right)$ into $\left(W^1_{q'}\left(0,T;Y^*\right)\cap\left\{y^*\left(t\right)\mid y^*\left(0\right)=0\right\}\right)^*$ by virtue of condition (ii) and because of first two terms are linear bounded operators. Moreover, inequalities

$$\varepsilon\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},L\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\right\rangle dt+\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},Lx_\varepsilon\right\rangle dt+$$

$$\int\limits_0^T\left\langle f(t,x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)),Lx_\varepsilon\right\rangle dt-\int\limits_0^T\left\langle y,Lx_\varepsilon\right\rangle dt\geq\varepsilon C_0\left\|\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\right\|^\nu_{L_q(0,T;Y)}+$$

$$\varphi\left(\left[x_\varepsilon\right]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)}\right)\left[x_\varepsilon\right]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)}-c_1\left\|y\right\|_{L_q(Y)}\left[x_\varepsilon\right]_{L_p(\mathcal{M}_0)}-\left(1+\varepsilon\right)C_2\geq$$

$$\left[\varphi\left(\left[x_\varepsilon\right]_{L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)}\right)-c_1\left\|y\right\|_{L_q(0,T;Y)}\right]\left[x_\varepsilon\right]_{L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)}-c \tag{6.14}$$

are fulfilled for any $x_\varepsilon\in W^1_p\left(0,T;X_0\right)\cap\left\{x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)\mid x_\varepsilon\left(0\right)=0\right\}$.It is also clear that for a sufficiently large $p-$norm of $x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)$ there is a subset of $L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ such that the last expression in (6.14) is greater than zero under the conditions of Theorem 2. These and conditions *iii* and *iv* show that the other conditions of the above mentioned result are fulfilled and, consequently, the equation (6.13) is solvabile (see also [**20**]). Thus, for each $y\in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ there is a function $x_\varepsilon\in\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right)$ that satisfies the equation (6.13) for any $\forall y^*\in W^1_{q'}\left(0,T;Y^*\right)$ i.e.

$$\varepsilon\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},\frac{dy^*}{dt}\right\rangle dt+\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},y^*\right\rangle dt+$$

$$+\int\limits_0^T\left\langle f(t,x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)),y^*\right\rangle dt=\int\limits_0^T\left\langle y,y^*\right\rangle dt,\quad\forall y^*\in\overset{0}{W}{}^1_{q'}\left(0,T;Y^*\right). \tag{6.15}$$

The equality (6.15) can be rewritten in the form

$$\varepsilon\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},\frac{dy^*}{dt}\right\rangle dt=\int\limits_0^T\left\langle y-\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}-f(t,x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)),y^*\right\rangle dt$$

where $y-\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}-f(t,x_\varepsilon\left(t\right))$ belongs to $L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ because of $y\in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ and $\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}$, $f(t,x_\varepsilon\left(t\right))\in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ for any $x_\varepsilon\in\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}\left(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y\right)$. Hence, according to our conditions, for each fixed $\varepsilon>0$, and boundedness of the right part of (6.14) we obtain $\frac{d^2x_\varepsilon}{dt^2}\in L_q\left(0,T;Y\right)$ and consequently, the boundary condition $\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\mid_{t=T}$ is defined properly. Thus, the function $x_\varepsilon\left(t\right)$ is a solution of the equation

$$-\varepsilon\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{d^2x_\varepsilon}{dt^2},y^*\right\rangle dt+\int\limits_0^T\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},y^*\right\rangle dt+$$

$$+\int_0^T \langle f(t,x_\varepsilon(t)),y^*\rangle\,dt=\int_0^T \langle y,y^*\rangle\,dt,\quad \forall y^*\in L_{q'}(0,T;Y^*)\,. \tag{6.16}$$

On the other hand, considering this equation for any $y^*\in W^{\ 1}_{\ q'}(0,T;Y^*)$ and comparing it with (6.15) we obtain $\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\mid_{\ t=T}=0$ (by using argumentations similar to those from [**10, 6**]).

Hence, we proved that the problem (6.11)-(6.12) is solvable in the space $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y)$ $\cap\, W^{\ 2}_{\ q'}(0,T;Y)\cap\left\{x_\varepsilon(t)\,\middle|\,\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\mid_{\ t=T}=0\right\}$ for each fixed $\varepsilon>0$.

Now, it is necessary to pass to the limit at $\varepsilon\searrow 0$. To this end, we need the uniformly on ϵ estimation of $\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}$.

Further, we consider the equation

$$-\varepsilon\int_0^T \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\left\langle x_\varepsilon,Lx^k\right\rangle\theta^s(t)\,dt+\int_0^T \frac{d}{dt}\left\langle x_\varepsilon,Lx^k\right\rangle\theta^s(t)\,dt=$$

$$\int_0^T \left\langle y(t)-f(t,x_\varepsilon(t)),Lx^k\right\rangle\theta^s(t)\,dt\equiv\int_0^T \left\langle f_0(t,x_\varepsilon(t)),Lx^k\right\rangle\theta^s(t)\,dt, \tag{6.17}$$

where $\left\{\theta^s(t)\,x^k\right\}_{s,k=1}^{\infty}$ is a complete system in $W^1_p(0,T;X_0)$, and consequently, $\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}$ is a solution of the problem

$$-\varepsilon\frac{d^2x_\varepsilon}{dt^2}+\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}=f_{0\varepsilon}(t),\quad t\in(0,T) \tag{6.18}$$

$$x_\varepsilon(0)=0,\quad \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\mid_{\ t=T}=0, \tag{6.19}$$

as $x_\varepsilon(t)$ belongs to a bounded subset of $L_p(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0)$ and $f_0(t,x_\varepsilon(t))$ belongs to a bounded subset of $L_q(0,T;Y)$ at $\varepsilon\searrow 0$, consequently $f_{0\varepsilon}\in L_q(0,T)$ and belongs to a bounded subset of this space at $\varepsilon\searrow 0$ and under the conditions of $y(t)$.

The solution of the problem (6.18)-(6.19) satisfies

$$\frac{dx_\varepsilon(t)}{dt}=\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^{T-t} f_{0\varepsilon}(T-\tau)\ exp\left\{-\frac{T-t-\tau}{\varepsilon}\right\}d\tau.$$

Applying the generalized Minkowski's inequality and taking into account that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^\infty exp\left\{-\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon}\right\}d\tau=1$ we get $\left\|\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt}\right\|_{L_q(0,T;Y)}\leq C<\infty$ for some positive C that is undependent on ε. Thus, for each $y(t)\in L_q(0,T;Y)$ the function $x_\varepsilon(t)$ belongs to a bounded subset of the space $\underset{0}{\mathbf{P}}_{1,p,q}(0,T;\mathcal{M}_0,Y)$ uniformly on ε. The "reflexivity" of $\mathcal{M}_0$ and the reflexivity of Y allow us to pass to the limit for $\varepsilon\searrow 0$ in all terms of the (6.17) except for the first one. Therefore, it remains to estimate just the first term of (6.17). We have

$$\left|-\varepsilon\int_0^T\left\langle\frac{d^2x_\varepsilon}{dt^2},y^*\right\rangle dt\right|\leq\varepsilon\int_0^T\left|\left\langle\frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt},\frac{dy^*}{dt}\right\rangle\right|dt\leq$$

$$\varepsilon \left\| \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt} \right\|_{L_q(0,T;Y)} \left\| \frac{dy^*}{dt} \right\|_{L_{q'}(0,T;Y^*)}$$

for any $y^* \in W^1_{q'}(0,T;Y^*) \cap \{y^*(t) \mid y^*(0) = 0\}$. Taking into account the estimation $\varepsilon \left\| \frac{dx_\varepsilon}{dt} \right\|^\nu_{L_q(0,T;Y)} \leq C < \infty$ for $\nu > 1$, that is valid by virtue of the a priori estimations, we get

$$\left| -\varepsilon \int\limits_0^T \left\langle \frac{d^2 x_\varepsilon}{dt^2}, y^* \right\rangle dt \right| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{\nu-1}{\nu}} \widetilde{C} \left\| \frac{dy^*}{dt} \right\|_{L_{q'}(0,T;Y^*)}.$$

This means that the first term of (6.17) vanishes when $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Thus, considering the equation (6.17) for any $\xi \in L_p(0,T;X_0)$, passing to the limit at $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ and taking into account that $\ker L^* = \{0\}$ complete the proof of Theorem 2.

References

[1] S. Agmon, A. Douglis, L. Nirenberg , Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions, I. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 12, 1959, 623–727; Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions, II. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 17, 1964, 35–92.

[2] S. Angenent , On the formation of singularities in the curve shortening flow, J. Differential Geom., 1991, 33, 3, 601-633.

[3] J. Bebernes, V. A. Galaktionov, On classification of blow-up patterns for a quasilinear heat equation, Differential Integral Equations 9 (4) (1996) 655-670.

[4] O. V. Besov, V. P. Il'in , S. M. Nikol'skii , *Integrated submissions of functions and embedding theorem*, Nauka, Moscow, 1996 (Russian).

[5] R. Courant, D. Hilbert, *Mthods of Mathematical Physics, v. I, II.* (1953, 1962), Interscience, N.-Y.

[6] Ju. A. Dubinskii , Weakly convergence into nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations, Matem. Sborn., (1965), 67, n. 4.

[7] A. Friedman, B. McLeod , Blow-up of solutions of nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 1987, 96, 55-80.

[8] R. S. Hamilton , The Ricci flow on surfaces, Contemp. Math., 1988, 71, 237-262.

[9] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order,* (1983), Springer-Verlag.

[10] J.-L. Lions , *Quelques methodes de resolution des problemes aux limites non lineares*, (1969) DUNOD, Gauthier-Villars, Paris.

[11] J.-L. Lions, E. Magenes , *Nonhomogeneous boundary value problems and applications,* (1972), Springer-Verlag, N.-Y.

[12] S. Luckhaus, R. Dal Passo , A degenerate diffusion problem not in divergence form, J. Differetial Equations, 1987, 69, 1-14.

[13] C. B. Jr. Morrey, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of Variations,* (1966), Springer-Grunl. Math. Viss., 130.

[14] O. A. Oleinik , The mathematical problems of the boundary layer theory, 1968, Math. Survey, 23, 3, 3-65 (Russian).

[15] E. M. Stein , HarmonicAnalysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals, (1993), Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

[16] K. N. Soltanov , Periodic solutions of certain nonlinear parabolic equations with implicit degeneracy, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1975, 222, no. 1-2, 291–294 (Russian).

[17] K. N. Soltanov , Solvability nonlinear equations with operators the form of sum the pseudomonotone and weakly compact, Soviet Math. Dokl.,1992, v.324, no.5, 944-948.

[18] K. N. Soltanov , *Some applications of nonlinear analysis to differential equations*, 2002, ELM, Baku (Russian).

[19] K. N. Soltanov , Some embedding theorems and its applications to nonlinear equations. Differensial'nie uravnenia, 20, 12, 1984.

[20] K. N. Soltanov , On some modification Navier-Stokes equations, Nonlinear Analysis, TMA, (2003), 52, 4.
[21] R. Temam , Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems in mechanics and physics, (1988), Springer-Verlag, N.-Y.
[22] T. Tsutsumi, M. Ishiwata , Regional blow-up of solutions to the initial boundary value problem for $u_t = u^{\delta}(\Delta u + u)$, Proc.Roy.Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 1997, 127, 4, 871-887.
[23] W. Walter , Existence and convergence theorems for the boundary layer equations based on the line method, Arch. Rational Mech. and Anal., 1970, 39, 3, 169-188.
[24] M. Wiegner , A degenerate diffusion equation with a nonlinear source term, Nonlinear Anal.TMA, 1997, 28, 1977-1995.
[25] M. Winkler , Blow-up of solutions to a degenerate parabolic equation not in divergence form, J. Diff. Eq. 2003, 192, 445 - 474.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences, Hacettepe University Beytepe, Ankara, TR-06532, TURKEY
E-mail address: `soltanov@hacettepe.edu.tr ; sultan_kamal@hotmail.com`

Current address: Department of Mathematics, Holyoke Community College, 303 Homestead Ave., Holyoke, MA, 01040 , USA
E-mail address: `mahmadov@hcc.edu`